

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

Michael Gerard Naessens,

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01473-JAD-VCF

Plaintiff

v.

**Order Denying Motions to Extend Time**

Frank Breslin, et al.,

[ECF Nos. 15, 16]

Defendants

Pro se plaintiff Michael Gerard Naessens filed two motions to extend time to respond to defendant Andrew Barron’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.<sup>1</sup> He contends that Barron “committed perjury” in the motion to dismiss and asks the court to “provide an indefinite extension, or at least two weeks” more to file his response and to “file motions to deal with [Barron’s alleged] perjury.”<sup>2</sup> Naessens also avers that he was “hospitalized on September 24th due to seizures associated with [his] disability,” which made it “difficult to communicate in a timely manner with the court.”<sup>3</sup> But on October 25, 2022, Naessens filed an opposition to Barron’s motion, which substantively responds to Barron’s personal-jurisdiction arguments.<sup>4</sup> In his response, Naessens requests “an opportunity to amend” it if it is “flawed due to [his] pro se [status] and the fact that [he] is still undergoing seizures due to [his] disability.”<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF No. 15 (motion to extend time); ECF No. 16 (emergency motion to extend time); ECF No. 7 (Barron’s motion to dismiss).

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 15 at 4.

<sup>3</sup> ECF No. 16 at 4, 5.

<sup>4</sup> ECF No. 18.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 5.

1 Because Naessens filed a responsive opposition to Barron's motion to dismiss, I deny his  
2 motions to extend time as moot. And because Naessens does not identify any particular  
3 arguments in opposition that he would add or expand upon if given more time, I deny his request  
4 for an opportunity to amend. As for Naessens's request for an "indefinite extension" to file  
5 motions related to Barron's alleged perjury, that request is also denied. Naessens hasn't  
6 identified any court-imposed deadlines that are hampering his ability to file any motions that he  
7 believes are necessary to address his concerns. If Naessens is aware of a deadline that he wishes  
8 to extend, he must file a motion identifying that deadline and stating the reasons warranting an  
9 extension.

10 Naessens is also reminded that defendants Frank Breslin and Lawrence H. Richardson Jr.  
11 filed a separate motion to dismiss on October 25, 2022.<sup>6</sup> Naessens's response to that motion is  
12 due by **November 8, 2022**.

### 13 Conclusion

14 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff Michael Gerard Naessens's motions to  
15 extend time [ECF Nos. 15 and 16] are **DENIED**.

16  
17  
18   
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey  
November 1, 2022

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  

---

 <sup>6</sup> ECF No. 17.